



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,213	09/22/2006	Magnus Normark	502.1258USN	5909
33369 7590 10/16/2009 FASTH LAW OFFICES (ROLF FASTH) 26 PINECREST PLAZA, SUITE 2 SOUTHERN PINES, NC 28387-4301				
EXAMINER BENGZON, GREG C				
ART UNIT 2444		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 10/16/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sloan.smith@fasthlaw.com

nan\_russell@fasthlaw.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/599,213

**Applicant(s)**

NORMARK ET AL.

**Examiner**

GREG BENZON

**Art Unit**

2444

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **OFFICE ACTION**

This application has been examined. Claims 1-17 are pending.

#### ***Making Final***

Applicant's arguments filed 06/25/2009 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

The claim amendments regarding -- *'interface being distinct and separate from the device with second protocol objects to be managed, the second protocol' -- and -- 'the first management application requesting the interface to read or update the corresponding first protocol objects' -- and -- 'the interface mapping the corresponding first protocol objects onto the second protocol objects to be managed in an interface database to translate the corresponding first protocol\_objects into the second protocol understood by the second management application'* -- alter the scope of the claims but do not overcome the disclosure by the prior art as shown below.

The Examiner presents new grounds for rejection as necessitated by the claim amendments and is thus making this action FINAL.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 06/25/2009 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

The Examiner interprets the claimed method and system as directed towards statutory subject matter as embodied by the server for hosting the interface (Applicant

Specifications Page 10 Lines 30, Page 11 Lines 15-20) and transmitting translated signals to the client device to perform the data management operations on the device. The Examiner interprets the said method as inherently requiring a computer device to implement the interface, various applications, transmit signals and perform the data management operations on the client device described as physical equipment in Applicant Specification Page 9 Lines 5-10. Furthermore the Examiner does not detect any indication in the Applicant Specifications indicating the server as a purely software component and hence interprets said server as comprising a hardware component.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) [*in italics*]:

*...Mariana also fails to teach or suggest the steps of the first management application identifying which first protocol objects correspond to the second protocol object to be management and requesting the interface to update the corresponding first protocol objects...*

*... Mariana's interface is not distinct and separate from his smart card. ...The cited references are void any discussion of an interface that is distinct and separate from the device (smart card) with second protocol objects to be managed...*

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

Arbo disclosed a universal data mapper for enabling SnycML commands to be interpreted according to the special translation requirements of each individual mobile

device. The universal data mapper accepts the messages exchanges between the client devices and the web servers and is separate and distinct from said client and web servers. While Arbo disclosed embodiments wherein the second protocol is related to PIM data Arbo Paragraph 79 explicitly disclosed wherein the said universal data mapper is applicable to any type of data/protocol.

Arbo Paragraph 55 disclosed wherein the SyncML server is operable to call the universal mapping program methods MapToUC and MapToVCard upon receipt of a vCard or a request for an update of the dPIM data of a client device 104 received from the web server 120 and the sync engine 122, and to thereby initiate mapping of PIM data between the server iPIM storage object 114 and a vCard. The SyncML server 124 is also operable to handle protocol conversion and/or related tasks associated with the communication of vCards via the SyncML protocol.

Arbo disclosed (re. Claim 1) said *interface being distinct and separate from the device with second protocol objects to be managed*' (Arbo-Figure 1, universal data mapper item 126, Paragraph 55) -- and -- *'the first management application requesting the interface to read or update the corresponding first protocol objects'* (Arbo-Paragraph 11, *Once mapping is completed, the universal mapping program transforms the mapped data into a form suitable for storage in the server computer system's database or for communication, as a vCard, to the client device'*) -- and -- *'the interface mapping the corresponding first protocol objects onto the second protocol objects to be managed in an interface database to translate the corresponding first protocol objects into the second protocol understood by the second management*

*application. (Arbo-Paragraph 11 , 'Once mapping is completed, the universal mapping program transforms the mapped data into a form suitable for storage in the server computer system's database or for communication, as a vCard, to the client device' )*

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) *[in italics]*:

*A rationale for combining Mariana, Chakravorty, DM and Kuo can be found on page 10 where it is stated that the combination is obvious because it would enable automatically and selectively translate each file, URL, or file reference as they should be when the contents of the smart card are read." Again, this merely states a benefit without the required explicit and articulated reasoning with rational underpinning...*

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

Mariana Column 4 Lines 40-55 clearly indicates a need for communication interfaces between smart card applications and remote servers on the Internet in order to perform device management operations such as (Mariana-Column 6 Lines 60-65) downloading, updating and/or deleting applications or parts of applications stored in the smart card (files, programs, scripts, etc.) via the internet network. SyncML DM protocol facilitates device management operations by indicating the URL of the target data set but does not take into account smart card files.

Chakravorty disclosed implementing the SIM toolkit for reading descriptor files which are on the smart card. Thus Chakravorty implicitly disclosed a file management system on the smartcard.

Kuo disclosed assigning and storing a URL on the smart card wherein said URL represents a smartcard file.

The Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to a person such as Mariana who desires to bridge the gap between the SIM card management protocol and the SyncML DM protocol that the common attribute between the two said protocols is the ability to perform file operations wherein the file is identified by a URL.

The Examiner notes that where DM requires a URL to identify the source/target dataset, it would have been obvious to assign a URL to a SIM card file as disclosed by Kuo, and implement a relationship between the DM target URL and the SIM file URL in order to eliminate the need for manual intervention by the user and allow for direct dialogue between the smart card and the applications on the remote servers as desired by Mariana Column 5 Lines 66.

***Priority***

This application claims benefits of priority from Foreign Application 0402091-3 filed August 25, 2004. (SWEDEN)

The effective date of the claims described in this application is August 25, 2004.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 9-10, 12-14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mariana (US Patent 7047558) further in view of Chakravorty ( US Patent 7139372) further in view of Arbo (US Publication 2004/0093342).

Mariana disclosed (re. Claim 1) a method for device management by managing objects in devices in a device management system in a mobile network infrastructure, the system having a first server with a first device management application using a first protocol, (Mariana-Figure 3, '*enclosure HTTP server*') a second server with a second device management application using a second protocol, (Mariana-Figure 3, '*card HTTP server*') an interface between them and a device (Mariana-'*smart card*') with objects to be managed, the method comprising:

a) the first management application initiating a device management session with the interface in order to manage the objects in said device, (Mariana-Figure 4, module 642, Column 13 Lines 35-55)



b) the interface translating the objects to be managed (Mariana-Column 6 Lines 40-45) into a form understood by the second management application (Mariana-Figure 4, module 842) and invoking management operations to be made by the second management application, and

c) the first management application performing the management operations to said device. (Mariana-Column 6 Lines 65)

While Mariana substantially disclosed the claimed invention Mariana did not disclose (re. Claim 1) a device management system in a mobile network infrastructure.

Chakravorty disclosed (re. Claim 1) a device management system in a mobile network infrastructure. (Chakravorty- Column 8 Lines 45-55, *SIM toolkit provides an interface for reading, downloading, deleting descriptors that are stored on the SIM virtual vault storage*)

Chakravorty disclosed managed data objects stored on the SIM card in the form of descriptors which indicate the URL from the which the content can be downloaded.

Mariana and Chakravorty are analogous art because they present concepts and practices regarding operations performed on smart card data objects. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Chakravorty into Mariana. The motivation for said combination would have been to enable management of digital data

and applications over SIM-enabled mobile devices. (Chakravorty-Column 5 Lines 20-25)

While Mariana-Chakravorty substantially disclosed the claimed invention Mariana-Chakravorty did not disclose (re. Claim 1) said *interface being distinct and separate from the device with second protocol objects to be managed, the second protocol -- and -- 'the first management application requesting the interface to read or update the corresponding first protocol objects' -- and -- ' the interface mapping the corresponding first protocol objects onto the second protocol objects to be managed in an interface database to translate the corresponding first protocol objects into the second protocol understood by the second management application.*

Arbo disclosed a universal data mapper for enabling SyncML commands to be interpreted according to the special translation requirements of each individual mobile device. The universal data mapper accepts the messages exchanges between the client devices and the web servers and is separate and distinct from said client and web servers. While Arbo disclosed embodiments wherein the second protocol is related to PIM data Arbo Paragraph 79 explicitly disclosed wherein the said universal data mapper is applicable to any type of data/protocol.

Arbo Paragraph 55 disclosed wherein the SyncML server is operable to call the universal mapping program methods MapToUC ( ) and MapToVCard ( ) upon receipt of a vCard or a request for an update of the dPIM data of a client device 104 received from the web server 120 and the sync engine 122, and to thereby initiate mapping of PIM data between the server iPIM storage object 114 and a vCard. The SyncML server 124

is also operable to handle protocol conversion and/or related tasks associated with the communication of vCards via the SyncML protocol.

Arbo disclosed (re. Claim 1) said *interface being distinct and separate from the device with second protocol objects to be managed*' (Arbo-Figure 1, universal data mapper item 126, Paragraph 55) -- and -- *'the first management application requesting the interface to read or update the corresponding first protocol objects'* (Arbo-Paragraph 11, Once mapping is completed, the universal mapping program transforms the mapped data into a form suitable for storage in the server computer system's database or for communication, as a vCard, to the client device' ) -- and -- *'the interface mapping the corresponding first protocol objects onto the second protocol objects to be managed in an interface database to translate the corresponding first protocol objects into the second protocol understood by the second management application.* (Arbo-Paragraph 11, 'Once mapping is completed, the universal mapping program transforms the mapped data into a form suitable for storage in the server computer system's database or for communication, as a vCard, to the client device' )

Mariana, Chakravorty and Arbo are analogous art because they present concepts and practices regarding operations performed on smart card data objects. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Arbo into Mariana-Chakravorty. The motivation for said combination would have been to enable to support new types of client devices through the mere addition of new configuration files respectively designed for the new types of client devices. As a consequence, it is not necessary to perform the

costly, time consuming and resource intensive design, programming, testing, and implementation of custom software device drivers in order for the universal mapping system to support the mapping of personal information management data between a new type of client device and a synchronization server system.(Arbo-Paragraph 12)

Claim 12 (re. a system) is rejected on the same basis as Claim 1.

The motivation to combine described in the rejection for Claim 1 applies to Claim 12.

Furthermore Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo disclosed (re. Claim 12) a database storing mapping relationships between first protocol objects to be managed and second protocol objects to be managed. (Chakravorty-Column 8 Lines 15-20)

Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo disclosed (re. Claim 2) steps of: d) the first management application responds to the interface, e) the interface translates the objects to be managed into a form understood by the first management application, (Mariana-Column 6 Lines 40-45) and f) the first management application continues said device management session with the interface.

Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo disclosed (re. Claim 3,13) wherein mobile network infrastructure comprises the GSM network and a public network, such as internet.  
(Mariana-Column 10 Lines 45-55)

Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo disclosed (re. Claim 4,14) wherein the device with the objects to be managed is selected from a SIM card in a mobile station, (Chakravorty-Column 7 Lines 65 thru Column 8 Lines 45) a USIM card in a mobile station, a handset in a mobile station, and a smart card in a computer connected to a handset in a mobile station.

Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo disclosed (re. Claim 6,16) wherein the device with the objects to be managed is the SIM card in a mobile station and the second device management application uses a SIM File Management (SFM) protocol. (Chakravorty-Column 8 Lines 45-55, *SIM toolkit provides an interface for reading, downloading, deleting descriptors that are stored on the SIM virtual vault storage*)

The Examiner notes that SIM File Management protocol is described in the SIM Application Toolkit.

Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo disclosed (re. Claim 9) wherein the interface checks the identity of the device by means of a subscription identity (Mariana-Column 13 Lines 10-55) such as IMSI or MSISDN, and handset identity, such as the IMEI from a repository in the infrastructure. (Chakravorty-Column 7 Lines 65 thru Column 8 Lines 15, 'GSM SMS')

Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo disclosed (re. Claim 10) wherein the RFM protocol command includes also the selection of the transport channel. (Chakravorty-Column 7 Lines 65 thru Column 8 Lines 15, 'GSM SMS')

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mariana (US Patent 7047558) further in view of Chakravorty ( US Patent 7139372) further in view of Arbo (US Publication 2004/0093342) further in view of SyncML DM Protocol Version 1.1, published February 15, 2002 hereinafter referred to as DM.

While Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo substantially disclosed the claimed invention Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo did not disclose (re. Claim 5,15) wherein the first device management application uses the SyncML DM protocol.

DM disclosed (re. Claim 5,15) wherein the first device management application uses the SyncML DM protocol. (DM-Page 8, Page 12)

Mariana,Chakravorty,Arbo and DM are analogous art because they present concepts and practices regarding operations performed on smart card data objects. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine DM into Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo. The motivation for said combination would have been to enable transfer management actions between client and management servers. (DM-Page 7, Overview)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-8,11,17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mariana (US Patent 7047558) further in view of Chakravorty ( US Patent 7139372) further in view of Arbo (US Publication 2004/0093342) further in view of SyncML DM Protocol Version 1.1, published February 15, 2002 hereinafter referred to as DM, further in view of Kuo (US Patent 7322513).

Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo-DM disclosed (re. Claim 7,17) wherein the data objects to be managed are OMA-DM managed objects (DM-Page 12, Section 8.3, SyncBody parameters) and data entities residing on SIM understood by a SIM File Management (SFM) protocol . (Chakravorty-Column 7 Lines 65 thru Column 8 Lines 45)

The Examiner notes that as per Applicant Specifications Page 12 the mapping consists of assigning a URL to the SIM object file.

While Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo-DM substantially disclosed the claimed invention Mariana-Chakravorty-DM did not disclose (re. Claim 7) wherein the data objects to be managed are OMA-DM managed objects (DM-Page 12, Section 8.3,



SyncBody parameters) that are mapped onto data entities residing on SIM understood by a SIM File Management (SFM) protocol .

Furthermore Kuo disclosed (re. Claim 7) wherein the data objects to be managed are OMA-DM managed objects (Kuo-Column 3 Lines 10-45, URL and HTML files) that are mapped onto data entities residing on SIM understood by a SIM File Management (SFM) protocol .

The Examiner notes that where DM requires a URL to identify the source/target dataset, it would have been obvious to assign a URL to a SIM card file as disclosed by Kuo, and implement a relationship between the DM target URL and the SIM file URL.

Mariana,Chakravorty,Arbo,DM and Kuo are analogous art because they present concepts and practices regarding operations performed on smart card data objects. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Kuo into Mariana-Chakravorty-DM. The motivation for said combination would have been to enable automatically and selectively translates each file, URL, or file reference as they should be when the contents of the smart card are read. (Kuo-Column 2 Lines 10-15)

Mariana Column 4 Lines 40-55 clearly indicates a need for communication interfaces between smart card applications and remote servers on the Internet in order to perform device management operations such as (Mariana-Column 6 Lines 60-65)

downloading, updating and/or deleting applications or parts of applications stored in the smart card (files, programs, scripts, etc.) via the internet network. SyncML DM protocol facilitates device management operations by indicating the URL of the target data set but does not take into account smart card files.

Chakravorty disclosed implementing the SIM toolkit for reading descriptor files which are on the smart card. Thus Chakravorty implicitly disclosed a file management system on the smartcard.

Kuo disclosed assigning and storing a URL on the smart card wherein said URL represents a smartcard file.

The Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to a person such as Mariana who desires to bridge the gap between the SIM card management protocol and the SyncML DM protocol that the common attribute between the two said protocols is the ability to perform file operations wherein the file is identified by a URL.

The Examiner notes that where DM requires a URL to identify the source/target dataset, it would have been obvious to assign a URL to a SIM card file as disclosed by Kuo, and implement a relationship between the DM target URL and the SIM file URL in order to eliminate the need for manual intervention by the user and allow for direct dialogue between the smart card and the applications on the remote servers as desired by Mariana Column 5 Lines 66.

Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo-DM-Kuo disclosed (re. Claim 8) wherein for each OMA-DM protocol command, the translation is performed by selecting the appropriate RFM protocol command equivalent based on the mobile device type, more specifically, the SIM card type. (Kuo-Column 4 Lines 10-15)

Mariana-Chakravorty-Arbo-DM-Kuo disclosed (re. Claim 11) wherein the interface translating the objects to be managed is an application making use of a conversion map holding the relationships between objects to be managed of different protocols.

The Examiner notes that as per Applicant Specifications Page 12 the mapping consists of assigning a URL to the SIM object file.

The Examiner notes that where DM requires a URL to identify the source/target dataset, it would have been obvious to assign a URL to a SIM card file as disclosed by Kuo, and implement a relationship between the DM target URL and the SIM file URL. Furthermore it would have been obvious to implement a table consisting of the URL/object relationships to facilitate the lookup and matching of the URL/object.

### ***Conclusion***

**Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to the enclosed PTO-892 form.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREG BENGZON whose telephone number is (571)272-3944. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571)272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. B./

Application/Control Number: 10/599,213

Page 21

Art Unit: 2444

Examiner, Art Unit 2444

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444